

REMARKS

In response to the Notice of Non-Responsiveness mailed July 20, 2006, Applicants submit the following additional remarks to supplement the response filed April 19, 2006 and thank the Examiner for the telephone conversation of August 9, 2006 between Examiner Mitchell and Angelo J. Gaz of Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman.

The Patent Office states that the reply filed on April 25, 2006 ("the prior response" herein) is not fully responsive because the Applicant did not address the Examiner's position that although Shibata is silent as to how scribe lines are formed, it teaches a wafer cut along its scribe lines after formation of the scribe lines, and thus motivates use of a cut groove along scribe lines where a scribe line is expressly needed prior to the cut. However, Applicant asserts that it is not necessary for Applicant to address the Patent Office's argument above, as the response argues a different claim limitation than the one addressed above, the response argues that the limitation which is not taught by the references is not only with regard to the claim requirement of "scribing through the substrate along scribe areas" but also with regard to the claimed requirement of "after scribing, removing a portion of the coating by a dissolution process to expose the plurality of contacts." The prior response does not need to address the Patent Office's argument above about scribe lines or scribing because the prior response argues that the cited references do not teach or suggest removing a portion of the coating by a dissolution process to expose the plurality of contacts, after scribing. Thus, without limitation thereto, regardless of whether or not the references teach or suggest forming scribe lines, forming grooves, and /or scribing through the substrate along the scribe lines or grooves, the Applicant's position is that the references do not teach or suggest removing a portion of the coating after scribing. Hence, Applicants disagree with the Notice of Non-Responsiveness mailed July 20, 2006 and respectfully request the Patent Office withdraw the Notice of Non-Responsiveness, as it is not necessary for the Applicants to respond to the above-noted Patent Office position since the Applicants are arguing a different limitation.

Hence, for at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office withdraw the Notice of Non-Responsiveness and properly consider the response filed April 25, 2006.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 21, 2006

By: _____

Angelo J. Gaz; Reg. No. 45,907

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California
90025
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (310) 820-5988

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Amber D. Saunders 8/21/06
Amber D. Saunders Date